

**MINUTES**  
**BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY**  
**Monday, June 17, 2013, 3:00 p.m.**  
**City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604**  
**Green Bay, WI 54301**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Diedrick—Chair, Ann Hartman, Sup. Andy Nicholson

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Corday Goddard

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rob Strong, Robyn Hallet, Stephanie Schmutzer, Ben Fauske, Matt Roberts, Pat Leifker, Robert Hornacek (WLUK - Fox 11)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the minutes from the May 20, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of the minutes from the May 20, 2013, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

2. Letter from Housing Authority Insurance Group regarding dividends received

R. Hallet reported that the letter from the Housing Authority Insurance Group is regarding dividends that the BCHA has received in two checks, one for \$167.51 and the other for \$530.90.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to receive and place on file the letter from Housing Authority Insurance Group. Motion carried.

**REPORTS:**

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
  - A. Preliminary Applications  
P. Leifker reported that there were 77 preliminary applications for May 2013.
  - B. Unit Count  
P. Leifker reported that the unit count for May 2013 was 3,062 units.
  - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses  
P. Leifker reported that the Housing Assistance Payments for May 2013 was \$1,216,175.00.
  - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance  
M. Roberts reported that there were 320 inspections in May 2013, and of those 54.38% passed their first inspection, 23.12% passed the reevaluation, and 22.5% failed.
  - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)  
P. Leifker reported that for May 2013 there were 275 port-out units and 23 port-in units. The total administrative funding received from HUD was \$99,213.00, and the administrative expense was \$103,541.48. The administrative overspent difference was \$7,900.15.

F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, new contracts, homeownership)

P. Leifker reported that there were 96 FSS clients in May 2013, 34 escrow accounts, no graduates, 3 new contracts, and 69 homeowners.

G. VASH Reports (active VASH, new VASH)

P. Leifker reported that there were 19 VASH clients and 2 new VASH clients for May 2013.

H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

P. Leifker reported that there were 3 new investigations assigned, 2 new investigations closed, 2 previous investigations closed, and 2 investigations still active.

P. Leifker also added that 5 out of the 6 fraud investigations were in Green Bay, and 1 was in Ashwaubenon.

I. Reasons for Background Screening Denials

P. Leifker reported that there were no background checks because there have been no current lease-ups.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

4. Discussion and possible action to approve use of reserve funding due to federal funding cuts

R. Hallet stated that with sequestration, the BCHA's administrative fees are currently at 69%. With this significant decrease, BCHA staff is working with ICS in finding ways to reduce costs. A current issue that we are dealing with is increasing the voucher utilization; we want to administer as many vouchers as possible, which increases administrative fees and secures funding for next year. However, ICS staff is at its capacity with workload and do not have time to issue additional vouchers without hiring more staff. ICS has not refilled various vacated staff positions.

B. Fauske stated that with sequestration, ICS has suspended new lease-ups and hiring additional staff to keep costs as low as possible. The voucher issuance situation was discussed with a HUD representative, who recommended that BCHA begin issuing vouchers and utilize the BCHA's reserve funds. The BCHA's reserves are larger than the national average in both the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) funds and the Administrative funds. If BCHA does not utilize their reserves funds, eventually the funds could be lost to the federal government. HUD also recommended ICS continue leasing up new clients because they have the funds available to do so. Also ICS has found that their client specialists are handling higher caseloads than they should be. With work overload, this jeopardizes high performance status along with clientele services. He requested use of the reserves funds to lease-up new clients and bring on new staff. He reported that they are short two positions.

B. Fauske further reported that HUD highly recommends Housing Authorities to have one month of funding in reserves, but BCHA has over 6 months in reserves for their administrative fees. BCHA is recommended to use their reserve funds, or they could lose them the following year. If BCHA decides to spend its reserves, then the HAP reserves

would decrease to about \$1.6 million. BCHA's target is to administer about 3,150 vouchers, and this will take about \$38,000 from the Administrative funds.

A. Hartman questioned if the federal government will take the reserves funds regardless of how well BCHA has administered the Housing Choice Voucher Program. B. Fauske replied it will be taken away if the BCHA does not utilize it.

A. Nicholson asked why BCHA would want to increase the voucher usage. A. Hartman responded that increasing the voucher usage would increase the amount of funding for next year. A. Nicholson inquired if the BCHA needs more funding.

B. Fauske explained that the long waiting list demonstrates there is a need for housing assistance, and the BCHA thus needs to increase the voucher usage.

A. Nicholson inquired if the federal government will take the waiting list along with the funding. B. Fauske responded no; we would just have to serve fewer clients, and the size of the waiting list would only increase.

A. Nicholson questioned how many people are on the waiting list. P. Leifker replied that the waiting list is currently 500-600 families.

A. Hartman inquired if all the people on the waiting list are Brown County residents. P. Leifker explained the waiting list is broken into preferences based on Brown County residency, which the 500-600 families does not include non-residents since they haven't pulled off of that waiting list for over 10 years.

A. Nicholson questioned why the waiting list number does not include the non-residents. P. Leifker replied that non-residents are in fact counted but are not included in the above count of 500-600. This is because BCHA targets families of Brown County residency before helping families outside of Brown County. He explained that the 500-600 people on the waiting list only refers to people of Brown County, and adding the non-Brown County applicants to the count would make the number larger.

B. Fauske stated that BCHA's goal is to transition families to self sufficiency by helping them become educated and find work, and the 3,000+ families receiving vouchers rotates to new families who need help.

A. Nicholson inquired where the families on the waiting list are living now while they're waiting. P. Leifker and M. Roberts responded that not all of them are homeless and could be in a variety of situations, for example living with friends, going through a divorce, paying their rent but not being able to pay their other bills, living in substandard housing, etc.

R. Strong stated that the reserves are funds that have to be used for Housing Assistance Payments; they cannot be used for anything else. Furthermore, although HUD recommends holding one month's reserve, he personally recommended we keep it a bit higher. B. Fauske interjected that \$1.2 million would be a one-month reserve, but we want to bring it down to \$1.6 million.

A. Nicholson restated for clarity that the idea is to use the reserves to help the BCHA through the end of the year, so we can get more HUD funding the following year. B. Fauske confirmed this is accurate and further explained that having qualified people on the waiting list will justify the increase in voucher utilization.

A. Nicholson questioned if all 600 people on the waiting list are qualified for vouchers. R. Hallet responded that the applications are only preliminary, and ICS does not determine qualification until the application reaches the top of the waiting list. B. Fauske added that approximately 25-50% will not qualify or don't follow through for the assistance.

A. Nicholson inquired if the reserves funds are only used for Administrative fees. B. Fauske explained that there are two funds: one is the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) fund which is only used to pay landlords on clients' behalf and currently is roughly \$2.6 million. For example, to lease-up an additional 200 people, ICS would have to come up with the money to pay the landlords because sequestration has reduced the HAP funds that we receive. We would therefore have to pull from the reserves to pay for these new clients. In this way, next year when HUD determines funding, it is based on the total number of vouchers we pay monthly this year.

A. Nicholson questioned what would happen next year if BCHA does not receive funding. B. Fauske replied that we'd be in the same situation in which ICS will have to continue to suspend leasing up vouchers, which would cause the waiting list to grow. A. Nicholson inquired if the waiting list could go somewhere else. A. Hartman stated that no other Housing Authority is accepting applicants to be on their wait list. She stated that BCHA is the only Housing Authority that has an open waitlist in comparison to Chicago and Minneapolis where they are no longer accepting applications. Since BCHA is still accepting people on the waiting list, people are coming here to get a voucher. R. Hallet interjected that *some* people are coming here to get a voucher; *some* housing authorities have closed waiting lists. A. Nicholson expressed his opinion that "*some*" is quite a bit. R. Hallet stated there are also a lot of people who live here who need a voucher, to which A. Nicholson disagreed.

T. Diedrick stated that the percentage of assisted families moving out of Brown County is very low. He explained that when you look at the number of port-outs compared to the total number of vouchers leased every month, it's a low percentage.

A. Nicholson stated that it would be interesting to know the percentage of people coming into the county that say they are county residents who are applying for vouchers. Staff responded that there is no way of knowing that. R. Strong mentioned that the BCHA sent out a survey two to three years ago that inquired about this kind of information. R. Hallet explained that the results of the survey showed that the majority of people applying for the Housing Choice Voucher Program are indeed what many would consider to be residents of Brown County. A. Nicholson expressed that we just said that there's no way of knowing this information but now we're saying this is known. R. Hallet reiterated that the survey was from three years ago; this information is not known for the applicants currently on the waiting list. A. Nicholson clarified that he wants to know how many people are coming in from surrounding areas that are establishing themselves as Brown County residents.

P. Leifker explained that when someone applies, they need to indicate if they are a resident or not. If they claim that they are, they need to provide a proper ID, as well as two pieces of documentation confirming their local address, and they are thus considered a Brown County resident. Applicants who are non-Brown County residents are placed on the non-preference list. A. Nicholson reiterated that he knows this but what he is asking is how many are coming from outside of the area to get on our program, and he thinks we should know this information.

B. Fauske stated that currently the port-out percentage is 9%; 91% of voucher holders are staying here. M. Roberts explained that while we don't have data to directly answer

A. Nicholson's question, other information about the waiting list is telling. He went on to explain that within the preference category there are sub-preferences of 1) displaced families and then 2) the elderly, disabled, and veterans. With the suspension of leasing up new vouchers, the numbers in these subcategories continue to rise. When we begin issuing vouchers, we will follow this order and issue vouchers first to these categories, which are generally not populations that tend to port-out. M. Roberts offered to email Commissioners the breakdown of the number of applicants in each subcategory.

R. Strong stated that the issue with port-out has been discussed at the last meeting with a representative from Reed Ribble's office. Some other Housing Authorities are not dealing with the same problem because they are not accepting applications or don't have enough funding to serve additional clients from the waiting list. He said it was made clear to Reed Ribble's representative that they need to take a look at some of the regulatory changes BCHA has suggested in the past.

B. Fauske stated that the representative from Reed Ribble's office has contacted him about some information. He responded quickly, and she is talking to a Washington representative about the issue. R. Strong added that information was sent out several years ago and yielded no results, so now maybe Reed Ribble will take this on.

B. Fauske asked A. Nicholson for clarification if his concern is that by issuing more vouchers, the number of port-outs will only increase. A. Nicholson agreed that is his concern. B. Fauske agreed this is a major concern. R. Strong added that there are local residents on the waiting list as well, but with the rules in place, we cannot restrict people from porting out so there's not an easy way around this.

During the meeting, R. Hallet found and reported on the results of the survey of applicants conducted several years ago: 88% of applicants resided in Brown County; of those, 37% lived in Brown County for 10 or more years, 8% lived here 6-9 years, 14% lived here 1-5 years, and 32% lived here less than 1 year. R. Hallet expressed that the greatest concern may be regarding the 32% who've lived in Brown County less than a year, but it is positive to see that 37% resided in Brown County for 10 or more years and furthermore 59% reported living here for over a year, 45% for over 5 years. R. Strong pointed out another important factor is that 25% lived in Brown County, moved away, and have now moved back. R. Strong stated that BCHA is not aware of the reasons why people move out of Brown County and then come back to Brown County. R. Hallet reported that the survey results indicate a main criteria for moving to Brown County is because of friends, family, and employment in the area. R. Strong stated that the surveys were voluntary and optional.

T. Diedrick stated that the big issue is that HUD reviews the count of money and vouchers used, and this determines the budget for the following year. M. Roberts confirmed this is correct: HUD looks at the count for January through September to determine the following year's funding, so lease-ups during this time period is of the utmost importance. M. Roberts indicated that they have briefing packets made, calendars ready to schedule appointments; they just need the manpower to do it.

T. Diedrick inquired if new staff to ICS will be temporary employees. B. Fauske replied that they considered this but don't think that would be the best strategy due to the learning curve for the position and staff turnover from time to time. He also added that in talking to HUD, they are encouraging BCHA/ICS to make use of the reserves.

T. Diedrick summarized that the options are to use the reserves or do nothing and risk the possibility of losing some of the reserves. R. Strong added that utilizing the reserves fund is

not sustainable, but BCHA needs to bring the reserves numbers down. He expressed that it's unfortunate that they can't do more to ensure it is true Brown County residents that would receive the vouchers, but we have stretched those rules to the limit. He reiterated, as the survey showed, that the majority of applicants are from Brown County, so it would be wrong to deny serving them. T. Diedrick also expressed that he is concerned about those who are residents, so we really need to think about using the reserves and risk having some port-outs with that.

A. Hartman stated that she is concerned with using the reserves funds because it risks the funding for the following year. If we don't get enough funding next year to support the additional people we've leased up, would we have to terminate some people from the program? She inquired about why HUD would provide additional funding next year if we use reserves this year. B. Fauske replied that HUD will set funding nationally. Further, with the current sequestration, this is hopefully the lowest the funding will be; we're assuming in the future it will be at this level or more. If we use some of the reserves annually, it will still last 20 or more years. He reiterated that HUD states our reserves are higher than they typically see and recommends that we put these funds to work to help improve the program. The goal is not to have a high savings account; it is to help the folks who need it. He emphasized that the reserves are designed to be used in these very times when federal funding is low due to sequestration.

R. Strong stated that having a month's reserves is safest in case HUD would be late in distributing their funds. We can still make payments to the landlords who are expecting their checks. He expressed that he is just as concerned about HUD funding the vouchers as he is about not having enough funds to administer the program – to have enough manpower to keep the program running. When ICS prepares a budget for next year, BCHA will focus on what is sustainable over time with using the reserves funds for the future. BCHA will also be looking at what ICS will do to improve the program and make it more customer friendly, which is also a good use of the reserves. B. Fauske agreed that those are the two main reasons for the reserves: emergency situations like now and special projects for program improvement.

A. Nicholson inquired if ICS budgeted for this. B. Fauske responded that ICS did not budget for sequestration and has already leaned up the staffing. A. Nicholson questioned if ICS had any reserves. R. Strong replied that BCHA holds the program reserves. B. Fauske responded that ICS has some of its own reserves but not enough for additional staffing.

A. Nicholson inquired if ICS would be able to administer the program through the end of the year without using the BCHA's reserves funds. B. Fauske answered that without the reserves funds, ICS will continue to suspend leasing up new vouchers and continue working understaffed. R. Hallet added that this would affect the whole community. She mentioned that she is a member of the Brown County Housing and Homeless Coalition, which monthly discusses the concerns caused by not issuing additional vouchers. Not leasing up more vouchers affects homeless shelters and transitional housing programs because they are not able to move people in and out. A. Nicholson expressed that homeless reports from the Protection and Welfare Committee show that the majority of homeless people are from outside of Brown County, which is a concern. He's not going to support this.

A. Hartman asked for clarification that ICS wants to hire two more people and issue 150 more vouchers, for which funding would come from reserves. The hope is then that HUD will then provide additional funding the following year to continue to support these additional vouchers, but if they don't, would we have to continue to use reserves? B. Fauske responded that there is turnover within the program, but the reserves funds will have to be

utilized if there is no additional funding available. P. Leifker reported that about 30 people are terminated from the program each month, and those vouchers are not being offered to other families currently. M. Roberts expanded on this explaining that when new vouchers are issued, they call in extra families because they know there is a percentage that are not successful in leasing up.

R. Hallet clarified that if BCHA was not to receive funding for the following year, HUD will help and guide the Housing Authority with other strategies before terminating families from the program, which would be the last resort.

R. Strong also explained that if there were to be no additional funding available, then the BCHA/ICS may need to cut back on administration. A. Hartman asked if that means that new staff hired would lose their job later. R. Strong responded not necessarily because those are the positions that are needed to keep the program going; ICS would have to find other areas that could be cut. He mentioned that the first budget draft should be presented in October.

A. Nicholson inquired about why ICS did not fill its vacant staff positions earlier. B. Fauske replied it's because of sequestration; they wanted to be safe due to cuts, so they decided to suspend everything and acted very conservatively. A. Nicholson again inquired if ICS could get through the year without filling the positions. B. Fauske responded yes, but if there is a need in the community, and we are sitting on seven to eight times the recommended savings, the community is going to look at BCHA/ICS very poorly if we choose to do nothing.

A. Nicholson stated that BCHA should focus on the needs of the people of Brown County compared to those coming from outside the area. He expressed his opinion that the results of the survey show that we are catering to people from outside of our community. To him, residing here one to five years is not a Brown County resident. He stated in his view, about half and half of those who are applying are Brown County residents, in his definition of residents. To him, this is not a need. He feels that the residents would stay and the others would leave and take their vouchers with them. B. Fauske reminded him that historically, 9% are porting out; 91% are staying.

T. Diedrick shared his explanation of this situation in a different scenario. He explained that like many non-profit organizations, they (at Options for Independent Living) have an endowment fund that is used for unmet needs. They have found that donors want to see organizations use their endowment funds. Therefore, Options is using part of the endowment every year to make it work for the people. He sees this as the same situation, that the reserves need to be used in order to secure more funding for the future. In his opinion, we don't have a choice but to use the reserves.

A. Nicholson expressed that he disagrees and that BCHA is serving non-residents who moved to Brown County for an unknown reason. R. Hallet clarified that the reason cited on the survey for coming to Brown County is to be with friends and family.

B. Fauske inquired about the strategy for the utilization of the Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative reserves funds. A. Nicholson replied that vouchers should be given to other communities in need; we don't have to spend the reserves.

B. Fauske asked what BCHA would do with the 600 people on the waiting list. A. Nicholson responded that the majority of the wait list applicants are non-Brown County residents (according to his definition of residents). He added that the Protection and Welfare Committee has proven that more than 50% of the homeless population is from outside of

Brown County. BCHA should assist the residents of Brown County instead of leasing up new vouchers to non-Brown County clients.

B. Fauske questioned what will happen to Brown County residents on the waiting list without leasing up new vouchers. A. Nicholson replied that waiting an additional 6 months is not a long wait. R. Hallet clarified that most of them have been waiting at least a year already.

A. Hartman stated that she does not like what St. John's Homeless Shelter has done to her neighborhood, and she is not interested in assisting drunkards. She inquired how clients at the homeless shelters who are alcoholics are handled. R. Hallet responded that a client who is disruptive or has a criminal background due to their drinking would not qualify for a voucher. P. Leifker stated that they take a lot of referrals from Freedom House and other community shelters, but the numbers from St. John's is very low, likely because they don't qualify. A. Hartman stated her neighbors are not against helping people, but they don't want to be assisting people who are coming here from other areas because they can get better welfare benefits here.

A. Hartman questioned if the applicants who will be served first are veterans, people who've been here for a long time, longer than 5 years. P. Leifker explained the preference categories' order of first displaced individuals, then, elderly or disabled, and veterans. R. Hallet also added that there are some victims of the apartment complex fire in Allouez at the top of the waiting list, but we've been unable to help them because we are not currently issuing vouchers.

A. Hartman inquired if a victim from the fire who has been a Brown County resident for only 6 months would still qualify for the voucher program. R. Hallet responded that the victim will qualify because the client is considered a displaced Brown County resident, regardless of how long they've lived here.

P. Leifker said he just verified that the actual number on the waiting list is 753. A. Hartman asked if only 150 of them will be assisted. P. Leifker explained that vouchers will continue to be issued until we reach the goal of 3,150. Thereafter, each month as approximately 30 families drop off the program, ICS will take 30-50 applicants off the waiting list to make up for those lost by natural attrition. They will continue to serve the highest preferences first.

A. Hartman questioned the qualifications for the clients from the Freedom House. P. Leifker responded that Freedom House clients would have to provide verification that they are homeless and receiving case management, then they would qualify for the preference after those who are displaced. He clarified that elderly, disabled, veterans, and homeless (with children and receiving case management) all fall within one preference category.

A. Hartman inquired about the percentage of this category compared to the entire waiting list. M. Roberts said that is information they have but did not bring with them, but could provide it by email. A. Hartman clarified the preference categories.

T. Diedrick asked for a motion to determine if we want to use the reserve funding. A. Nicholson made a motion to deny. T. Diedrick called for a second to that motion. Being none, he asked if there was a motion to approve use of the reserve funding.

A. Hartman questioned if BCHA decides to use the reserves funds for this year, will they be able to review it for change in the future. P. Leifker stated that staff has monthly conference calls with HUD in which they will continue to review the forecasting tool to see where the numbers are at. So, this is something that we will continue to follow closely.

A. Nicholson stated that basically if we don't use the reserves, then there might not be a need for the vouchers next year. He asked A. Hartman if she wants more vouchers next year, in a higher percentage in her neighborhood, as this is a possibility.

A. Hartman inquired about how many vouchers ICS has as a total. P. Leifker responded there are 3,380 vouchers total. M. Roberts clarified that we are unable to administer all of these because of the Housing Assistance Payments funding. A. Hartman confirmed that about 3,150 is the number that we think we can use, so what happens with the rest that we can't use. P. Leifker stated they are unfunded. A. Hartman asked R. Hallet if we've never been able to use them. R. Hallet stated previously the funding was at 100%. T. Diedrick stated that years ago we had been able to use all vouchers.

T. Diedrick stated that port-outs are a new issue in the past 5 years; A. Nicholson added that it has been increasing because other housing authorities have closed their waiting lists while ours is still open.

A. Hartman asked for confirmation that the 150 vouchers that would be added would be the applicants who already live here and are on the waiting list, and it wouldn't be new people coming from outside of the area. P. Leifker responded that the applicants who are currently near the top of the waiting list have been on the list for six months to a year. Once the category of displaced, elderly/disabled, and veterans (and homeless with children who have case management) have been depleted, then the next category would be families with minors and those have been on the waiting list for at least a year. R. Hallet reported that aside from those at the top due to displacement, there is a group of approximately 70 families which ICS had invited to come in to receive a voucher, but then with the funding cuts, the vouchers could not be issued. These families would be the clients on top of the waiting list after the displaced applicants.

A. Hartman expressed her concern about what the federal government is doing, but that she doesn't want to see them take away the reserves. A. Nicholson said this could happen, but it isn't for sure. R. Hallet added that this situation occurred with the Green Bay Housing Authority; they did not receive their operating subsidy, and they had to resort to use their reserves.

A. Nicholson stated that ICS should utilize its budget for the rest of this year, and then we'll figure out what is needed for next year. R. Strong clarified that under the current contract, BCHA does not approve ICS' budget; rather BCHA provides ICS with 96.4% of all the Administrative funds. We all make our best guess of what the total of this would be, but that total got cut, so ICS got 96.4% of a smaller number. So the overall amount ICS thought they would get was cut. A. Nicholson stated that ICS has said they can get through this year; we should find out what they need for next year.

R. Strong stated that ICS would be holding at about 3,000 units. P. Leifker stated this isn't accurate because there would be the natural attrition, so they would lose about 200 participants by the end of the year, so it would decrease to about 2,800. Then we'd need about 350 to get us to the goal of 3,150 vouchers. P. Leifker reiterated that to increase by 350 isn't as simple as bringing in 350 clients and hoping they'll all lease-up; it's a much longer process that would take months to lease-up this many clients. B. Fauske also restated the concern that BCHA will have to answer to the fact that HUD recommended we issue more vouchers now, but we said no despite the community's issue of homelessness. B. Fauske urged the commissioners to think about these issues in making this decision.

R. Hallet stated that she understands A. Nicholson's concern that people outside of Brown County are coming here to take advantage of our services. A. Nicholson expressed that is the issue that is dividing this Authority.

B. Fauske expressed that the honest people shouldn't be the ones to suffer because of this. The challenging part is that ICS will have to look at the people displaced by the Allouez fire and tell them they can't help them. A. Nicholson offered to help do this, on behalf of the Authority.

B. Fauske restated that HUD's recommendation is not to continue to sit on our reserves. A. Nicholson expressed that HUD has no concern for Green Bay or Brown County; they could care less about us, whereas he does care. We can get through this year and then look at next year's budget and help out with what we have to from the reserves at that time.

A. Hartman stated that until that time, there are people from the fire that we technically have the money to help. She has no problem helping people from the fire or people who are veterans, but she would like to know how many are in each category. She doesn't want to help the bums, but she doesn't want to hurt the good guys.

R. Strong expressed that he is interested in helping the victims of the fire. He suggested BCHA could authorize 20 vouchers for those people. Then as a second step, have the breakdown of the rest of the waiting list at the next meeting. The chances of getting families from outside of town coming to just port-out becomes smaller when we have a better understanding of the numbers. He reiterated that every month that goes by, it will shrink the program; that is a consequence of doing nothing. HUD will look at our performance, which will be around 2,900 units, and that is how many units they will fund us for again next year with a possibility of another reduction in administrative costs.

A. Hartman inquired how many units were damaged in the apartment fire. Various people replied that there were 74 units within the apartment complex, but not all clients will qualify.

A. Nicholson suggested that this authorization be postponed until the next meeting when BCHA has more information about how many vouchers they will need to approve of.

T. Diedrick suggested we could help those specifically displaced by the fire who are eligible. A. Hartman stated she could support helping those displaced by the fire.

Discussion continued regarding how many displaced by the fire might be eligible and how many vouchers should be authorized. T. Diedrick suggested that BCHA authorize 20 vouchers to assist those who have been displaced by the fire. R. Strong added that if BCHA finds that more than 20 vouchers are needed, then a decision will be made again for the next meeting.

R. Hallet questioned what should be done if they find there are individuals who are on the waiting list that has been displaced for a different reason. R. Strong suggested that the vouchers could be available all residents who have been displaced.

A. Hartman indicated she would support helping up to 20 displacees. Furthermore, she would like to know if we authorized issuing another 150 the amount that would come from the various preference categories.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. Nicholson to authorize the use of reserve funds to issue a maximum of 20 vouchers to assist those who have been displaced, primarily those from the Allouez fire and, further, to provide a breakdown of the waiting list for next month. Motion carried.

R. Strong reiterated that the 20 vouchers will go to displaced victims who are Brown County residents and that the applicants in the other top preferences are probably long-term residents of Brown County, so this is addressing what we want to do.

M. Roberts stated that ICS will provide the Commissioners with the data showing the numbers of how many people are in the different preference categories. He can email this within a few days. He explained these numbers are run monthly, so at the July meeting he will provide what the numbers are at that time as well so they can see the comparison. He mentioned that there are over 100 applicants on the waiting list who fall into the elderly/disabled/veteran category, but he doesn't know the exact number. He clarified that to get to the goal of 3,150 vouchers, the majority if not all would be coming from that category.

5. Approval to renew agreement with Catholic Charities for reimbursement of pre- and post-homeownership counseling for Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers

R. Hallet stated that previously NeighborWorks Green Bay was the only agency that provided homeownership counseling for the Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers, but Catholic Charities wanted the opportunity as well. In 2010, BCHA offered this contract to Catholic Charities, which was renewed the subsequent years, and they are looking to renew the contract again for this year.

A. Nicholson asked who will pay, how much, and how many clients. R. Hallet responded that BCHA will pay Catholic Charities \$500 per client and that the previous two years there were no such clients.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of renewing the contract agreement with Catholic Charities for reimbursement of pre- and post-homeownership counseling for Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers.

A. Nicholson inquired how long the program has been around. R. Hallet replied that the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership program has existed in Brown County since 2001. A. Nicholson asked for clarification if any were involved last year. Is this program warranted if there is no one participating in it? R. Hallet responded that Catholic Charities had no participants last year but would like the opportunity to participate when there are new clients in the future.

A. Hartman questioned if the homebuyers have been satisfied with the counseling that Catholic Charities provided, if it was any different than NeighborWorks' counseling. R. Hallet answered that BCHA requires certain criteria for the counseling, for which Catholic Charities submitted an outline showing that they meet the criteria of what is required. R. Strong added that both Catholic Charities and NeighborWorks were trained by the same entity.

A. Nicholson inquired if this is a duplication of services and if the program is warranted. R. Hallet responded that the program is based on the housing market, and currently it is difficult for low-income families to receive a loan so there aren't as many families going through the Homeownership Program.

A. Nicholson asked if they don't utilize the money, would it come back to the BCHA. R. Hallet replied that it is not paid until clients have received the counseling. Catholic Charities would bill us when they have a client.

R. Strong stated that this was only for the Homeownership Program through the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Clients will have to be certified and then be able to purchase a home.

All agreed to the motion. Motion carried.

6. Review and approval of revision to Chapter 11 (Reexaminations) of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan

P. Leifker stated that if a family reports zero income, the Public Housing Authority (PHA) will conduct an interim reexamination. ICS is proposing to change these reexaminations from every 3 months to every 6 months as long as the family continues to report zero income. He explained that if a client has zero income, ICS brings them in for an interview to discuss how they are paying their bills and if there have been any changes in income. This is a procedure to check for updates on the client's income status. As an agency, ICS has determined that as a cost savings measure, it would be more beneficial to do these reviews every 6 months instead of quarterly. There are less than 200 such clients, and they generally report very minimal changes to their income. Such changes may result in only a dollar or two difference in the HAP, but to achieve that there is considerably more invested in postage, staff time, etc. P. Leifker stated that HUD requires these individuals to be met with on an annual basis.

A. Nicholson inquired about the purpose of having these reexaminations for every 6 months instead of every 3. P. Leifker reiterated that this change is a cost-efficiency measure in that the changes to the rent are not substantial enough to warrant it.

T. Diedrick pointed out that if ICS suspects a change, they still have a right to follow-up.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to approve of the revision to Chapter 11 (Reexaminations) of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan. Motion carried.

R. Hallet pointed out that the agenda says "revisions", but this was an error as there is only one chapter to be revised.

**INFORMATIONAL:**

7. Review of BCHA investments

S. Schmutzer stated that the BCHA is enrolled in the CEDARS program. She explained that an entity can only be insured for up to \$250,000 FDRC insurance, so CEDARS is a program that goes out to multiple banks to invest the money so BCHA does not have to go to multiple banks itself to ensure it stays insured. It's all in one spot, and they invest it to cover for the insurance. Nicolet Bank, where we have the CEDARS account, has a set rate of 0.3% which is a rate that is based off of the money market rate. This program is all 100% insured through all the various banks that they use, and they believe that the 0.3% will hold steady for the foreseeable future. She also contacted Harris Bank to find what their rate is and found that it is at 0.15%. So, while the 0.3% seems low, it's in line with other rates.

## 8. Status of Housing Intern

R. Hallet stated that the current intern Mackenzie Reed has graduated from University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, and she has been successfully hired by ICS. She explained that this leaves the Housing Intern position vacant, but the GBHA has an intern who is currently taking on M. Reed's duties. University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has been contacted to recruit a new intern for the fall semester.

### **BILLS:**

S. Schmutzer reported that there was an error on the last bill for the City of Green Bay. She explained that she voided the bill, it shows up twice, but it has only been paid once.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. Nicholson to approve the bills. Motion carried.

### **FINANCIAL REPORT:**

S. Schmutzer stated that she is working on entering data into the Quickbooks software from when the accountant position was vacant, so she does not yet have a financial report because the numbers would be skewed until all the data is entered.

### **STAFF REPORT:**

None

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Hartman to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Kv:rah:ejns